

REMARKS

A preliminary amendment and Information Disclosure Statement were filed January 7, 2008. Applicant respectfully asks for entry of that amendment and for consideration of those references.

The amendment filed herewith presumes the earlier entry of the amendment of January 7, 2008.

After entry of this amendment, claims 21 through 34 are pending. Claim 21 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as anticipated by published US patent application 2005/0049903 to *Raja*.

Drawing Amendment

The replacement sheets correct computer aided drafting errors as to the placement of objects and lines. No changes were made to the text or reference characters appearing in these figures. Annotated versions are filed herewith to identify in red marker the changes that were made. No new matter is submitted.

Support for box 1398 added to FIG. 13 may be found, *inter alia*, in the originally filed specification at paragraph [0125] *et seq.*:

View region 1362 (when not used for a data entry form as discussed above), includes ... list 1364. List 1364 includes any number of rows represented schematically by rows 1365-1367. Generally, rows 1365-1367 have a common format, though several formats are available (e.g., task list, contact list, appointment list, calendar grid, to name a few). Each row corresponds generally to descriptions discussed above (e.g., 462, 463, 472). ... At least one format is available for presenting a plurality of any type of item or data as discussed above, **information**, links, and icons for one such item or data per row. ... List 1364 may present **information** describing a plurality of records of database 206 that satisfy criteria for a query implied by an icon or link activated by the user.
(Emphasis added)

Information box 1398 is not new matter because amending FIG. 13 to include it merely allows the specification and the drawing to be consistent.

Amendment to the Specification

Typographical and grammatical errors are corrected and the disclosure of the written specification is merely made consistent with the disclosure of the drawing. No new matter is submitted.

In paragraphs [0105], [0114], [0118], [0123], and [0129], typographical and grammatical error is corrected.

In paragraphs [0061], [0066], and [0073], the correction finds support in the originally filed drawing.

In Table 1, the error and the correction are apparent from the description of other entity tables in rows of Table 1 such as the description entity table of 906, and from the description of other relationship tables such as relationship table 1132.

In paragraph [0124], the additional text refers to the amended drawing of FIG. 13 now showing INFORMATION 1398 as a part of row 1365. ‘Information’ amenable to illustration by INFORMATION 1398 was discussed in the originally filed specification as quoted for convenience below. The functions and purposes of the presentation of FIG. 13 as discussed in the originally filed specification would lead a person of ordinary skill to recognize that such ‘information’ was accidentally omitted from FIG. 13; that without the presentation of such ‘information’, the functions being described would not accomplish their intended purposes of giving notice of ‘information’ to the user.

[0118] Set of icons 1320 illustrates all possible icons. In a typical presentation according to schematic 1300, each icon may appear once, if at all. Set 1302 includes, as shown from left to right, **task** (clip board) icon 1311, calendar icon 1312, **person** (face) icon 1313, **folder** icon 1314, **email** (envelope) icon 1315, **note** icons 1316, 1317, and 1318, and RSVP (question mark) icon 1319. Each icon is presented when **unread (or unacknowledged) information** of the type implied by the icon is present in any affiliation the user has access to. **By activating the icon, a request is made to the server to prepare and present a list of the corresponding unread (or unacknowledged) information. According to various aspects of the present invention, such as list includes rows as described below with reference to 1364-1367.** Icon 1316 indicates at least one unread note of the type attached to a task. Icon 1317 indicates at least one unread note of the type attached to an **appointment (calendar item)**. Icon 1318

indicates at least one unread note of the type attached to a contact. In a preferred implementation, the color of each icon in set 1320 is uniform (all are green) and matches the color of icons of the set discussed below with reference to 1391-1396. Icons in set 1320 are responsive to posting of new and revised records in database 206 by any user at any time. **Consequently, users have prompt notice of information for collaboration.**

[0119] Navigation region 1332 includes text-menu box 1334 for user specification of an affiliation, text-menu box 1335 for user specification of an aggregation, set of icons 1338 and set of subscript icons 1352. **When any icon of set 1338 is activated, a suitable request is sent to the server and the server provides a corresponding presentation.** The presentation is limited to the specified affiliation (which may be “all” as discussed above) and aggregation (which may be “none” as discussed above). Icons 1311, 1313, 1314, and 1315 of set 1320 have identical shape and have functions similar to icons 1341, 1343, 1345, and 1346 of set 1338 respectively. **In response to activation of any icon of set 1338, a list of the requested information is presented in view region 1362.** Generally, a newly requested list replaces a prior list in full. In an alternate implementation, a newly requested list is appended to the bottom of view region 1362 and controls are provided to navigate (scroll backward, jump to item or end) into prior lists and items as desired.

[0120] **Specifically, the user receives a presentation of all tasks (e.g., a task list) on activation of task icon 1341.** A text box (not shown) for reviewing all task notes of the respective task may be included in the description 1364 of each task. **The user receives a presentation of all appointments in day (D), week (W), month (M), or date range (R) scope and format (e.g., a calendar column or grid) on activation of one of the calendar icons 1342.** The date range (R) may be specified by the user in the text-menu box as shown. **The user receives a presentation of all contacts (Persons) on activation of contact icon 1343. The user receives a presentation of all projects on activation of project icon 1344. The user receives a presentation of all folders (and hierarchical contents) on activation of files icon 1345. The user receives a presentation of all emails on activation of emails icon 1346.** Finally, the user receives a form for specifying any ad hoc criteria for a search on activation of search icon (magnifying glass) 1347.

[0123] View region 1362 (when not used for a data entry form as discussed above), includes Move button 1375, Copy button 1376 and list 1364. **List 1364 includes any number of rows**

represented schematically by rows 1365-1367. Generally, rows 1365-1367 have a common format, though several formats are available (e.g., task list, contact list, appointment list, calendar grid, to name a few). Each row corresponds generally to descriptions discussed above (e.g., 462, 563, 472). The functions discussed with reference to presentations 400 and 1300 may be combined in any suitable manner for ease of use by the user. At least one format is available for presenting a plurality of any type of item or data as discussed above, information, links, and icons for one such item or data per row. According to various aspects of the present invention, each row includes a set of icons similar in appearance to icons in other rows of list 1364, similar in appearance to icons of region 1302 and similar in appearance to icons of region 1332.

In all of the above quotations, emphasis is added here for clarity of presentation.

Novelty of the Claims

The Examiner has taken the position that each limitation recited in claim 21 is found in *Raja*. This rejection is traversed because *Raja* does not teach or imply every limitation of claim 21.

As to Claim 21.d. and e. the Examiner finds in *Raja* FIG. 10 checkboxes 1013 in rows 1007 as meeting the limitation: “a first plurality of rows in accordance with the first results, each row presenting ... a respective second icon having functionality in accordance with the respective portion of the first results ... for obtaining second results of a second query of the database in response to receiving from the user via the browser an operation of the respective second icon of a first row ...”. *Raja*’s complete description of 1013 states “A manual override is available in the form of a checkbox (1013) for each billable.” Confusingly, *Raja* shows the opposite in FIG. 10 where the button 1023 is labeled “Generate Invoice for selected Rows”. Under either interpretation of selection or manual override, checkboxes 1013 lack functionality. Consequently, checkboxes 1013 do not meet the limitation claimed.

Checkbox 1013 does not meet the limitation “obtaining second results of a second query ... in response to ... an operation of the respective second icon of a first row” at least because checkbox 1013 does not in any way invoke a query. Invoking a query is described on FIG. 10 for button 1023 as a “Generate invoice” function that relies merely on the state of checkboxes 1013 “for selected Rows”. Because button 1023 has a query function sufficient for the purpose

of the Accounting Invoice Generation Screen of FIG. 10 (see paragraphs [0024] and [0138] line 1), there is no implied query function for any checkbox 1013. Checkbox 1013 does not meet the limitation expressly or by implication.

As to Claim 21.e., the Examiner finds in *Raja* FIG. 10 the cooperation of items 1002, 1004, and 1013 as meeting the limitation: “obtaining second results of a second query of the database in response to receiving from the user via the browser an operation of the respective second icon of a first row of the first plurality of rows”. *Raja* does not describe any cooperation of item 1013 with items 1002 or 1004 whatsoever. Checkbox 1013 cannot correspond to a “second icon” as discussed above. Plainly items 1002 and 1004 cannot correspond to a “second icon” at least because they are not part of any of the rows 1007, which the Examiner identified as the “first plurality of rows”. Consequently, nothing in *Raja* meets this limitation.

As to Claim 21.f., nothing in *Raja* teaches or implies “presenting in the view region a second plurality of rows in accordance with the second results” at least because there is no “second icon” as discussed above for a user to operate to generate “second results”. Although button 1023 apparently performs a query after rows 1007 are presented, as implied by checkboxes 1013 and the legend on button 1023, nothing in *Raja* indicates that button 1023 produces a second plurality of rows 1007, which the Examiner apparently correlated to the “view region”.

As to Claim 21.f., the Examiner finds rows 1007 and button 1023 as meeting “each row of the second plurality ... presenting a respective third icon”. *Raja* does not teach or suggest anything other than one plurality of rows in region 1007 as a result of filtering. Button 1023 is not part of any row of region 1007. Consequently, neither 1007 nor 1023 meet the limitation recited in the claim. Further, nothing in *Raja* teaches or implies this limitation.

As to Claim 21.g., the Examiner finds button 1023 as meeting “beginning an accounting of time presently being spent by the user in association with the respective portion of the second results presented in a second row of the second plurality of rows in response to receiving from the user via the browser an operation of the respective third icon of the second row of the second plurality of rows”. As discussed above, *Raja* is completely silent and does not teach or suggest anything that could possibly correspond to “beginning an accounting of time”, “second results” “second row”, “second plurality of rows”, “respective third icon of the second row”, or “operation of the respective third icon”. The Examiner’s position is wholly without basis.

Further, *Raja*'s teaching of timesheet entry cannot include "beginning an accounting of time presently being spent" as recited in the claim. According to paragraph [0048] each Resource enters time on a screen shown in FIG. 2. These entries can only be made *after the total quantity of time* (called the "actual number of hours" in para. [0049]) is known to the Resource. Consequently, *Raja* merely teaches time entry in the past tense as opposed to time entry in the present continuous tense as claimed.

As to Claim 21.g., nothing in *Raja* teaches or implies "receiving from the user via the browser an operation of the respective third icon of the second row of the second plurality of rows". There is no third icon, as discussed above.

As to Claim 21.h., the Examiner found nothing in *Raja* that teaches or suggests "the database provides access by query to a plurality of email messages for the user". Indeed, *Raja*'s only teaching about email as to notifications does not express or imply "access by query ... for the user". *Raja* merely suggests a "push" technology as opposed to a "query" technology as claimed.

As to Claim 21.i., the Examiner found nothing in *Raja* that teaches or suggests "each respective information is capable of including ... a plurality of account records each adjusted in accordance with the respective accounting of time". Because *Raja* does not teach or suggest the "accounting of time" as discussed above, nothing in *Raja* teaches or suggests "account records each adjusted in accordance with" something that does not exist in *Raja*.

In summary, the novelty rejection is traversed in eight independent ways. As discussed above, there are at least eight different limitations that are not found in the reference. Any one basis is sufficient to traverse the rejection. Applicant respectfully asks that the rejection be withdrawn because a *prima facie* case for lack of novelty has not been made.

Interview

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the courtesy extended in the telephone interview held March 5, 2008. Claims 21 and 22 prior to the present amendment were discussed with reference to *Raja* and US patent 5,991,742 to *Tran*. No agreement was reached as to claim 21 or 22. The Examiner suggested that the teachings of *Raja* and *Tran* could be combined to reject claim 22. The Examiner suggested that a restriction requirement may be proper if it were

found that the subject matter of claims 21 and 22 imposed an unreasonable burden on the Examiner as to search of the prior art.

No Basis For Restriction

The subject matter of claims 22 and 21 cannot impose an unreasonable burden at least because this subject matter properly falls within one and the same class and subclass of the US patent classification system. Claim 22 is amended to include, “begins an accounting of time presently being spent by the first user in association with the respective item of the respective unread content” similar in some respects to amended claim 21 stating, “beginning an accounting of time presently being spent by the user in association with the respective portion of the second results”. Consequently, a search of either claim’s subject matter must include class 705/32 and probably should include class 434/108.

Class 705 includes “Data Processing: Financial, Business Practice: ... for apparatus and methods uniquely designed for or utilized in ... the management of an enterprise”. Subclass 32 includes “Time Accounting: ... for analysis ... of hours billable to an individual or other entity”. Class 434 includes “Education and Demonstration: ... for providing instruction about a subject”. Subclass 108 includes “exhibiting a plan for, or the status of, labor ... of a commercial or industrial enterprise”. None of the exclusions for these classes and subclasses would necessarily exclude the claimed subject matter.

In the interview, the Examiner stated that the claimed subject matter is classified in 715/700+ (claim 21) and 707/101 (claim 22, prior to this amendment) which classification would be grounds for restriction. Both of these classifications are improper. Consequently, there is no proper basis for restriction.

Class 715 covers “Data Processing, ... Operator Interface Processing ... wherein system level elements of computation ... are used prior to use in a display system”. “System level elements” seems to read on operating system functions as opposed to application software functions. The claimed subject matter seems unrelated to operating system functions. According to the subclass 700+ restrictions, “significantly claimed structure external to the user interface ... which displays ... an image ... related to such external structure is classified in the class appropriate to the external structure.” Class 707 covers “Data Processing: Database and File Management”. However, the general exclusions state that “the combination of the details of

database technology with the business data processing is classified in the business art.” Subclass 101 primarily includes “data structure conversion for optimization of database and file storing”, concepts that seem unrelated to the claimed subject matter.

The inventions claimed, however, are limited at least in part to “accounting of time” -- a process and/or type of information that seems to be strongly related to business management and business data processing.

Proper classification of the claims as amended will not admit a restriction requirement at least because there is no unreasonable burden upon the Examiner when the claims fall within one and the same classification.

Nonobviousness of the Claims

Due to the numerous shortcomings of the *Raja* reference discussed above, a combination with *Tran* as suggested by the Examiner is insufficient basis for an obviousness rejection. In addition to the lack of suggestion to combine, the proposed combination does not teach or suggest every limitation claimed by Applicant.

Another close reference US Patent 5,960,406 to *Rasansky* cannot serve as basis for obviousness either because of a similar lack of teachings and suggestions. *Rasansky* seems to discuss email (FIG 20) having unread and read status flags, groups (col. 5 line 8 *et seq.*), calendar overlays (col. 15 line 30 *et seq.*), personal calendar with user selected calendar overlays (FIG. 16A), calendar presentations that include links to details (1480 on FIG. 16A), and details having links to email (FIG. 21A 1700 discussed at col. 18 line 24 *et seq.*). However, among many other deficiencies, there is no disclosure of: (1) choosing a calendar overlay by providing the name of a group, (2) a view area with information and an icon per row for a subsequent query producing rows in the view area with other information and another icon per row for time accounting, and (3) any motivation for time accounting. Billing is discussed only with respect to charging users of a website for services provided by the website (col. 7 line 53 *et seq.*).

Consequently, a proposed combination of *Tran* with *Raja*, *Rasansky*, and/or any other art of record would not include every limitation claimed by Applicant. In addition, there is no motivation in common sense or in the art of record to make the combination claimed by Applicant.

Conclusion

Reconsideration is respectfully requested. Applicant believes the case is in condition for allowance and respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of the pending claims.

The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the telephone number listed below if it would in any way advance prosecution of this case.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 9, 2008

/William R Bachand/
William R. Bachand
Reg. No. 34,980

Bachand Law Office
P.O. Box 54244
Phoenix, AZ 85050
Phone: (602) 326-6237